GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS. Secrt. II-16—55,006—3-9-53.

Public (RD I) (1954.) Department.

Endorsement
D.O.
Memorandum
Lodged

No. 86282 RD PI/54-2

Dated 21/7/1954.

Passed
Sd
Supdt.

FURTHER PAPERS.

Department.	Number.	Series.	Date.

Ref, 2959/54-3. Project Executive Officer, S.K.,
Mangalore, dated 18-6-1954.

From
Sri.H.Narasimha,
Project Executive Officer,
Mangalore.

To.
The Director of Community Projects
& Addl. Secretary to
Govt. Agri. (C.D.P.) Dept. MADRAS.

DEPUTY SECRETARY'S OFFICE
25 JUN 1954
AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

86282

COMMUNITY PROJECTS--South Kanara--Civil Works--Contribution by Panchayats--Limit--Instructions--Solicited.

As a general rule for all works undertaken by the Community Project, a contribution of 50% of the total cost involved is expected from the public or from the Panchayat or from both. In a majority of cases in respect of wells, foot bridges etc. only 25% of the total cost is being accepted in view of the poverty of the people benefitted or the slender resources of the Panchayat. In a few cases, however, contributions up to 50% have been promised and they have readily accepted. A few Panchayat Boards have thus agreed to contribute 33% to 50% of the total cost in respect of a few works and on that basis, the works have been sanctioned. But the Inspector of Local Boards and Municipal Councils seems to think that the Panchayat Boards should not agree to contribute more than 25% in any case and has returned some proposals submitted by the Panchayats, e.g. the Panchayat Board, Ullal had agreed to contribute Rs. 510/- against the total cost of Rs.1020/- for a footbridge at Kotekar & Rs. 815/- against the total cost of ~~Rs~~ Rs.1620/- for a foot bridge at Kolva (Kotekar Village) within its jurisdiction. The Inspector of Local Boards and Municipal Councils has returned the proposals to the District Panchayat Officer with a query as to why more than 25% has been agreed to be given as contribution. I have replied to the District Panchayat Officer that as a rule 50% of the total cost is expected as contribution and that only in exceptional cases of poverty, 25% is accepted. The cases referred to above are those referred to in Government Endt. No.31362 Agri. (D.VIII) 53-4, dated 14-6-54. There are a few other petty cases also in which contributions above 25% have been promised by Panchayat Boards having due regard to their financial resources

I request that the Government may be pleased to inform the Inspector of Local Boards & Municipal Councils the correct position in regard to the quantum of contributions payable for community project works and instruct him not to raise objections to the Panchayat Boards contributing more than 25% of the cost, in cases where the financial position of the Panchayat concerned is sound.

As the execution of the works is being delayed for want of sanction from the Inspector of ~~Regional~~ Local Boards to the payment of Panchayat contributions, urgent action may kindly be taken in this matter.

Yours faithfully,

Project Executive Officer.

C/22-6-54.

Public (RDP):

~~Agri. (DI)~~ Dept.

Memo. No. 86282 ~~Agri.~~ RDP/DI/54-2 -7-1954.

Sub: Community Projects and Devt. Blocks - Execution of works - Contribution by Panchayats- scale - instructions re:

Ref: From the P.E.O., Mangalore, Ref.No.2959/54B, dated 18.6.1954:

A copy of the letter cited is ~~forwarded~~ Commd to the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards, Madras, ~~for information~~. He is informed that, ~~the~~ as public participation is the ~~genus~~ essence of the Community Devt. programme, ~~and~~ it is ~~therefore~~ necessary that the Panchayats should be encouraged to contribute as much as possible in the execution of works under the scheme. This will also enable additional works being taken up in the area and providing greater amenities to the local inhabitants. He need not, therefore, object to the Panchayats contributing more than 25% of the estimated cost of ~~the~~ works taken up ~~in~~ under the C.P. ~~areas~~ Schemes, so long as the Panchayat Boards come forward for making the payment and ~~so long as~~ the ~~finance~~ are sound of the Panchayats ~~will not be affected thereby~~.

To the Inspr. of Ml.Councils & L.Bds., Madras (w.e)
" P.E.O., Mangalore.
Copy to the P.E.O., Gandhigram, (w.e)
Erode and Palghat.
", allCollrs. other than the Collr. of Madras. "
" all B.D.Os. under the N.E.S., "
" the B.D.O., Cheranmahadevi, Chidambaram, Attur and Tirukkalikundram. "
" the Rev.Dvl.Officers -do- -do- "
" ~~DII, DV, DVI, DVII & DVIII~~ sections. "
Copy to HELA Dept (LA Branch).

P.L. Varma 16/7/54

P.I Cf.

To A.S.
For orders & issue P.I Cf
80 copies pm.
16/7/54 16/7/54

Seen by D.S. in m.t.

86282 DI/54

Agri. (DI) Dept.

Note:

Please see the reference from the P.E.O., Mangalore, in the c.f.

The draft on p. 1 above is for consideration.

H.E.L.A. may see before issue.

1/7/54

6/7/54

1.7.54. I agree with the view in the draft - under Local Dev works programme, Commission is however, the Planning (Major Dev) particular that not more than 25% should be received from any local board.

6.7.54

H.E.L.A.

H.E.L.A(L5).

The draft memo overleaf may be perused and the file returned to Agri. Dept.

9.7.54

10/7/54
A.D.S

Agri.

Agri (DI) Dept.

The note of H E L A above may be perused. The draft memo overleaf may now issue.

14/7/54 14.7.54.

[Issued as Memo no. 86282 ADI/54-2 dt. 21/7/54]

p.1 of

Re-

The diarrhoea epidemic was raised by 2 members during their visit to Chevarambadevi Block. The office has ignored its duties in dealing with the several complaints raised by the members. Answer separately.

Extract taken for preparation of reply 5/7/54

Agri no. 86282-DI/54-1.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO GOVT. 8 JUL 1954 68308 HEALTH, EDUCATION & LOCAL ADMN. DEPT.

J. R. 9.7.54

I have no objection to the draft memo being issued in English?

HELA no. 68308/54/54

SECOND ASSISTANT SECRETARY 13 JUL 1954 AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

[File retd. since A.S. on 21/7/54 being linked to another file]

Government of Madras
Public (R.D.P) Department

Memorandum No.86282 RDP-I/54-2 dated 21-7-1954.

Sub:-Community Projects and Development Blocks - Execution of works - Contribution by Panchayats - Scale - Instructions regarding.

Ref:-From the Project Executive Officer, Mangalore, Rei.No. 2959/54-B dated 18-6-1954.

A copy of the letter cited is communicated to the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards, Madras. He is informed that, as public participation is the essence of the Community Development Programme, it is necessary that the Panchayats should be encouraged to contribute as much as possible in the execution of works under the scheme. This will also enable additional works being taken up in the area and providing greater amenities to the local inhabitants. He need not, therefore, object to the Panchayats contributing more than 25% of the estimated cost of works taken up under the Community Projects Schemes so long as the Panchayat Boards come forward for making the payment and the finances of the Panchayats are sound.

N.V.Sugavanam,
Deputy Secretary to Government.

To the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards, Madras (with enclosure).
To the Project Executive Officer, Mangalore. ~~(with enclosure)~~.
Copy to the Project Executive Officers, Gandhigram, Erode and Palghat (with enclosure).
Copy to All Collectors other than the Collector of Madras (with enclosure).
Copy to All Block Development Officers under the National Extension Service (with enclosure).
Copy to the Block Development Officer, Cheranmahadevi, Chidambaram, Attur and Tirukkalikundram (with enclosure).
Copy to the Revenue Divisional Officers, Cheranmahadevi, Chidambaram and Chingleput (with enclosure).
Copy to All Sections in R.D.P.Branch,(with enclosure).
Copy to Health, Education and Local Administration Department, (L.A.Branch) (with enclosure).

Forwarded/By Order

V. N. Ramanan

Superintendent.

AP.217.

Copy of letter No.Ref.2959/54-B dated 18-6-1954 from the Project Executive Officer, Mangalore, to the Director of Community Projects, Madras.

Sub:-Community Projects - South Kanara - Civil Works - Contribution by Panchayats - Limit - Instructions - Solicited.

As a general rule for all works undertaken by the Community Project, a contribution of 50% of the total cost involved is expected from the public or from the Panchayat or

P.T.O.

from both. In a majority of cases in respect of wells, foot bridges etc. only 25% of the total cost is being accepted in view of the poverty of the people benefitted or the slender resources of the Panchayat. In a few cases, however, contributions upto 50% have been promised and they are readily accepted. A few Panchayat Boards have thus agreed to contribute 33% to 50% of the total cost in respect of a few works and on that basis, the works have been sanctioned. But the Inspector of Local Boards and Municipal Councils seems to think that the Panchayat Boards should not agree to contribute more than 25% in any case and has returned some proposals submitted by the Panchayats, e.g. the Panchayat Board, Ullal had agreed to contribute Rs.510/- against the total cost of Rs.1020/- for a footbridge at Kotekar and Rs.815/- against the total cost of Rs.1620/- for a foot bridge at Kolya (Kotekar Village) within its jurisdiction. The Inspector of Local Boards and Municipal Councils has returned the proposals to the District Panchayat Officer with a query as to why more than 25% has been agreed to be given as contribution. I have replied to the District Panchayat Officer that as a rule 50% of the total cost is expected as contribution and that only in exceptional cases of poverty, 25% is accepted. The cases referred to above are those referred to in Government Endorsement No.31362 Agri.(D.VIII) 53-4 dated 14-6-1954. There are a few other petty cases also in which contributions above 25% have been promised by Panchayat Boards having due regard to their financial resources.

I request that the Government may be pleased to inform the Inspector of Local Boards and Municipal Councils the correct position in regard to the quantum of contribution payable for community project works and instruct him not to raise objections to the Panchayat Boards contributing more than 25% of the cost, in cases where the financial position of the Panchayat concerned is sound.

As the execution of the works is being delayed for want of sanction from the Inspector of Local Boards to the Payment of Panchayat contributions, urgent action may kindly be taken in this matter.

(True copy)

V. N. Ramamurthi
Superintendent.

AP.217.

From
Sri E.G.Sivaswamy, B.Sc.,(Ag.), M.Sc.,
Block Development Officer Incharge,
Tiruvallur.

To
The Director of Community Projects,
M a d r a s.

Rc. 617/54-B dt. 31-7-54.



Sir,

Sub:- Community Projects and Development Blocks - Execution of works - contribution by Panchayats - scale - instructions.

Ref:- Government (R.D.P) Department Memorandum No.86282 RDP-I/54-2 dt. 21-7-54.

In the Government Memo cited, a reference has been made to the community Project areas. I request to be informed whether the Memorandum applies to National Extension Service Block also.

Nrv/1-8.

BLOCK DEVELOPMENT OFFICER I/C
TIRUVALLUR. 3/8

Pub. (RDP-I)Dept.

Memo.No. 735/RDP-I/54-2 dated ~~-9-54~~ 14.11.54

Sub: C.Ps. ~~and Devt. Blocks~~ N.E.S. - Execution of works - Contribution by Panchayats - Scale - Instns. - regarding.

Ref: Govt.Memo.86282 RDP-I/54-2, dated 21.7.54.

2. From the B.D.O., Tiruvallur, RC. 617/54-B, dated 31.7.54.

The B.D.O., Tiruvallur is informed that the instructions issued in the Govt. memo. cited will apply to ~~the~~ Block NES programm ~~as well~~ also.

The B.D.O., Tiruvallur, Chingleput dt.

Copy to the D.L.B.

Copy to ~~the Collr. of Chingleput dt.~~ all Colrs (except Trichy)

The Collr. of Madurai

Copy to all other B.D.Os. (N.E.S.)

Copy to D.D.R.D., Madras.

Copy to all Secns in the R.D.P. Branch

S.F.

Note:

Please see the letter from the B.D.O., Tiruvallur in the c.f. The draft memo. above is for consideration. N.E.L.A. may also see before issue. Though the N.E.S. areas have not been specifically mentioned in the memo., the intention (as will be apparent that it has been communicated to all Blocks under the N.E.S.) is that the orders shd. apply to the N.E.S. areas also.

In such cases, the original files should be put up, to note the discussions in them. Pl put up the file.

20.9.54

14/9/54

14/9/54

14/9/54

20.9.54

20.10.54

15/9/54

15/9/54 N.E.S-I/A

D.S.(R.D.P.)

Pub.(RD(P))

With reference to the orders of Dy. Secy. in the margin of p. 1 above, the original memo. is put up at (1) and the file is re-submitted for order.

Ur
6.9.54

6/9/54



~~D.S (R.D.P)~~

There is a later order, issued very recently, about panchayat boards being permitted to contribute more than 50% where no public contribution is forthcoming — and where the local boards are in a position to contribute — Please put it up.

Ur
30.9.54

Resubmitted with a copy of the memo. issued under the Janjore... I & (2) Presumably ... IVES. at (2). ~~Done~~

ur
17/10/54 Ur
18.10.54

19/10/54



~~D.S (R.D.P)~~

A may see the draft before issue.

Ur
20.10.54

H.E.L.A(LS) Pub(RDP) no 735/52

21-10-54
HELA no 10587/1/54

may be perused and returned to Pub.(RDP).

ur
11.54

CPG
6.11.54 : Pub (RDP)

Public (RDPI) Deptt

The draft memo. on p. 1 above may now issue.

11/11/54 12.11.54.

14/11/54

(Closed as memo. 735 RDPI/54-2 dt 14-11-54
and added to 8682 RDPI/54-2 dt 21/11/54